

Reply Brief

I hereby certify that this paper (along with any paper referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being transmitted via the Office electronic filing system in accordance with § 1.6(a)(4).

Dated: January 19, 2011

Electronic Signature for Charles A. Bieneman: /Charles A. Bieneman/

Docket No.: 99-703
(PATENT)

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of:

Sharyn M. Garrity et al.

Application No.: 09/426,442

Confirmation No.: 1897

Filed: October 25, 1999

Art Unit: 2439

For: SYSTEMS AND METHODS FOR SECURING
EXTRANET TRANSACTIONS

Examiner: C. J. Brown

REPLY BRIEF

MS Appeal Brief - Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

This Reply Brief is filed in response to the Examiner's Answer dated November 19, 2010 ("Examiner's Answer" or "Answer"), pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 41.37 (a) and in furtherance of the Notice of Appeal filed on July 14, 2010 and the Appeal Brief filed September 14, 2010, and appeals the claim rejections of the Examiner in the Final Office Action dated April 14, 2010 ("Final Office Action"), and the Advisory Action dated June 28, 2010 ("Advisory Action"). This application was filed on October 25, 1999.

Any fee associated with this Reply Brief are identified in an accompanying transmittal paper.

ARGUMENT

A. GROUND OF REJECTION NO. 1 (Claims 1 and 18-37)

The Examiner has confirmed that the rejection of claims 1, 27, and 37 under Section 101 has been withdrawn. (Examiner's Answer, pages 4, 10.) Accordingly, Ground of Rejection No. 1 is no longer at issue in this appeal.

B. GROUND OF REJECTION NO. 2 (Claims 1, 19, 20, 24, 25-27, 29, 30, 34, 35, and 36)

Independent claim 1, rejected as allegedly unpatentable over Davis in view of Schneider and further in view of Kuhn, recites in part:

a directory, coupled to the certificate authentication component, to maintain an account for each individual user, each account containing an access policy specifying at least one portion of the computer site to which the corresponding user is permitted access, each account further containing at least one of an internet protocol (IP) address and a certificate authorization method associated with the user.

The Examiner alleged that "Schneider teaches a user account with an associated IP address." (Office Action, page 4.) However, as discussed in the Appeal Brief (pages 11-14) while Schneider does discuss Internet protocol (IP) addresses, Schneider does not teach or suggest "each account further containing . . . an Internet protocol (IP) address," much less "an internet protocol (IP) address . . . associated with the user." Further, contrary to the Examiner's allegations (*id.*, page 2), Schneider does not teach or suggest an account containing "a certificate authorization method associated with the user," as recited in claim 1.

The Examiner responded to these arguments by stating that he interpreted "a 'range' of IP addresses as having an IP address associated with the user." (Answer, page 12.) Appellants respectfully submit that this position is untenable. A range of IP addresses is simply not the same thing as the IP address recited in claim 1. Indeed, claim 1 would function very differently in using a range of IP addresses, because a range of IP addresses could not be associated with an individual user, as is recited in claim 1. The Examiner's rejection of claim 1 must be reversed at least for this reason.

The Examiner further stated that "a user is in a group, and there are individual IP addresses in a range associated with users." (Answer, page 12.) That is, the Examiner appears to be

taking the position that a group of users is the same as the individual user recited in claim 1. Again, the Examiner's position is untenable. A group of users is simply not the same thing as an individual user. Further, the groups of users disclosed by Schneider are associated with ranges of IP addresses. (Schneider, column 23, lines 16-20.) Therefore, Schneider could not teach or suggest associating an IP address with an individual user as recited in claim 1. The rejection of claim 1 must be reversed for least this further reason.

Next, the Examiner stated that "Schneider does teach that a certificate may ID a user and be used for authorization." (Answer, page 12.) To support this allegation, the Examiner (Answer, page 12) cited a portion of Schneider that discusses an access filter identifying a user group to which a user belongs, and then determining groups to which the user belongs according to a trust level associated with "each of the identification methods." (Schneider, column 20, lines 10-34.) However, neither this portion of Schneider nor any other includes a teaching or suggestion of "a certificate authorization method associated with the user." As explained in the Appeal Brief (pages 13-14), Schneider teaches at most matching certificates to user groups, not users. Therefore, to the extent that Schneider consults information about individual users, such teachings are irrelevant to claim 1, because Schneider does not teach or suggest "a certificate authorization method associated with the user." The rejection of claim 1 must be reversed for least this yet further reason.

Moreover, the Examiner is incorrect to state that "since there is a user ID, associated with a user in a user group in a database [,] there is a user account" in Schneider, (Answer, page 13), or that any such teachings or suggestions by Schneider would read on the foregoing recitations of claim 1. For example, assuming *arguendo* that Schneider does teach a user account, Schneider does not teach or suggest "each account containing an access policy specifying at least one portion of the computer site to which the corresponding user is permitted access" because Schneider discloses at most associating access filters with user groups, not users. Further, as discussed above and in the appeal brief, Schneider's access filters are not access policies included in user accounts, nor are they associated with individual users. On its face, the mere existence of a user ID associated with a user in a user group in a database is insufficient to teach or suggest at least "each account containing an access policy specifying at least one portion of the computer site to which the corresponding user is permitted access, each account further containing at least one of an internet protocol (IP) address

and a certificate authorization method associated with the user,” as recited in claim 1. The rejection of claim 1 must be reversed for least this additional reason.

In sum, Schneider does not teach or suggest “each account further containing at least one of an Internet protocol (IP) address and a certificate authorization method associated with the user,” as recited in claim 1. Neither Davis nor Kuhn compensates for the deficiencies of Schneider. Therefore, claim 1, and all claims depending therefrom, are in condition for allowance over the cited references at least for the foregoing reasons.

Independent claims 27 and 37 both recite “each account further containing at least one of an Internet protocol (IP) address and a certificate authorization method associated with the user.” Therefore, these claims, and the claims depending from claim 27, are likewise in condition for allowance over the cited references at least for the foregoing reasons.

C. GROUND OF REJECTION NO. 3 (Claims 21, 22, 31, 32, and 37)

Each of claims 21, 22, 31, 32, and 37 is patentable at least by reason of dependence from one of independent claims 1 or 17, and therefore the rejection of these claims must be reversed.

D. GROUND OF REJECTION NO. 4 (Claims 18, 23, 28, and 33)

Each of claims 21, 22, 31, 32, and 37 is patentable at least by reason of dependence from one of independent claims 1 or 17, and therefore the rejection of these claims must be reversed.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above analysis, a reversal of the rejections of record is respectfully requested of this Honorable Board.

It is believed that any fees associated with the filing of this paper are identified in an accompanying transmittal. However, if any additional fees are required, they may be charged to Deposit Account 18-0013, under Order No. 65632-0632, from which the undersigned is authorized to draw. To the extent necessary, a petition for extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) is hereby made, the fee for which should be charged against the aforementioned account.

Dated: January 19, 2011

Respectfully submitted,

Electronic signature: /Charles A. Bieneman/
Charles A. Bieneman

Registration No.: 51,472
Michael B. Stewart

Registration No.: 36,018
RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC
Correspondence Customer Number: 25537
Attorneys for Applicant